DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 265 PS 018 505

AUTHOR Lazarus, Wendy; Gonzalez, Michelle
TITLE California: The State of Our Children 1989. Where We Stand & Where We Go From Here. Report Card and Briefing Book.
INSTITUTION Children Now, Oakland, CA.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 40p.
AVAILABLE FROM Children Now, 10951 West Pico Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90064.
PUB TYPE Reports - General (140) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Childhood Needs; *Children; Costs; Decision Making; Demography; Program Development; Program Evaluation; *Social Action; *Social Indicators; *Social Problems; *Sociocultural Patterns; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

This report and briefing book aim to inform Californians about the condition of the state's children in 1989. An initial set of anecdotes about Californian children and parents is followed by an overview, which discusses characteristics of the state's children, accountability in regards to spending on children and measuring their success, reasons for writing the report, the growing momentum for improving the conditions of the state's children, and the report's contents. The overview is followed by a "Report Card," which gives the state's efforts to meet children's needs a grade of D. The report card also provides statistics regarding several of the 27 indicators on which the state's preformance was rated. Subsequent sections of the report concern the costs for Californians of neglecting their children, ways to make California a "Class A" state for children and families, an agenda for action, and brief discussions of each of the 27 indicators used to prepare the report card on the state's performance. An appendix discusses limitations of the data in the project and the methodology used in the report. A seperate publication offers a brief overview of the report. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CALIFORNIA

ED317265

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE STATE OF OUR CHILDREN 1989

WHERE WE STAND AND WHERE WE GO FROM HERE

REPORT CARD & BRIEFING BOOK

A PUBLICATION OF CHILDREN NOW

HOW CALIFORNIA TREATS ITS CHILDREN

PS018505

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Children Now with Attribution
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Children Now is a non-partisan, statewide organization whose mission is to improve the lives of California's 7.6 million children. Children Now acts as a strong and consistent voice for all of California's children, with a particular emphasis on children and families who are poor or at risk. Our goal is to educate the public about the needs of children and to generate increased resources for effective programs that serve them.

Children Now blends substantive policy expertise with effective communications and advocacy strategies. We emphasize an integrated and preventive approach to investing in children—an approach designed to build a partnership among policy makers, the private sector, service providers, parents, and concerned volunteers.

Children Now operates statewide, with offices in Los Angeles, Oakland, and Sacramento. We are financed through foundation grants, individual donations, and support from the corporate, entertainment, and media production communities.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Angela Glover Blackwell	Urban Strategies Council
Hon. Allen E. Broussard	California Supreme Court
William Coblentz	Coblentz, Cahen, McCabe & Breyer
Charles Collins	Western Development Group
Geoffrey Cowan	Chilmark Productions, Inc.
Anita L. DeFrantz	Amateur Athletic Foundation
Danny Goldberg	Gold Mountain Records
Kati Haycock	The Achievement Council
F. Warren Hellman	Hellman & Friedman
Donald Kennedy	Stanford University
Judy Miller	Braun & Company
Jim Plunkett	Los Angeles Raiders
Judith Prowda	Management Consultant
Frank Quevedo	MALDEF
Hon. Cruz Reynoso	Kaye, Scholer, et al.
Richard J. Riordan	Riordan & McKinzie
George Roberts	Kohlberg Kravis Roberts & Co.
Marlene Saritzky	UBU Productions
Leigh Steinberg	Sports Attorney
Thomas Steyer	HFS Partners
Michael Tollin	Halcyon Days Productions
James Steyer	Children Now, President

Note: Organizations are listed for identification purposes only.

10951 West Pico Blvd.
Los Angeles, California
90064
213/470-2444

660 13th Street, Suite 300
Oakland, California
94612
415/763-2444

©1989 Children Now. Permission to copy, disseminate or otherwise use this work is normally granted as long as ownership is properly attributed.

CALIFORNIA:

THE STATE OF OUR CHILDREN 1989

WHERE WE STAND & WHERE WE GO FROM HERE

BY WENDY LAZARUS
WITH MICHELLE GONZALEZ

CREATIVE DIRECTOR: LAURIE LIPPER

This report was prepared in conjunction with a panel of distinguished California citizens:

Honorable Allen Broussard
Justice, California State Supreme Court

Jaime Escalante
Teacher, Garfield High School and subject of the film "Stand and Deliver"

Honorable Shirley Hufstedler
former U.S. Secretary of Education

Dr. Donald Kennedy
President, Stanford University

Peter V. Ueberroth

Special Advisors to this project include Children Now's Policy Advisors -- 28 leading children's policy and research analysts from California and throughout the nation (see inside back cover for complete listing) -- and James P. Steyer, President, and Cynthia D. Robbins, Executive Director of Children Now.

We thank Apple Computer, Inc., ARCO Foundation, AT&T, The Wallace Alexander Gerbode Foundation, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, The James Irvine Foundation, The A.L. Mailman Family Foundation, McKesson Foundation, The Rockefeller Foundation, Rosenberg Foundation, The San Francisco Foundation, and The Stuart Foundations for their support of Children Now's work.

©1989 Children Now™ All Rights Reserved

CALIFORNIA:

THE STATE OF OUR CHILDREN 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. The Children and Parents Behind the Numbers 5

II. Overview 6

III. The Report Card At A Glance 8

IV. The Costs of Neglect 10

V. Making California a "Class A" State 11

VI. An Agenda for Action: The Right Start 12

VII. A Guide to the Facts: Children's Benchmarks: 14

Number		Page	Number		Page
1.	Infant Mortality	16	15.	Drug-Exposed Babies	21
2.	Late or No Prenatal Care	16	16.	Youth Homicides	22
3.	Inadequate Immunization	17	17.	College-Bound Students	22
4.	Uninsured Children	17	18.	Unemployed Youth	22
5.	Use of Nutrition Program	17	19.	Teen Births	22
6.	Children's Mental Health	18	20.	Drugs/Alcohol	23
7.	Graduation Rates	18	21.	Incarcerated Juveniles	23
8.	Preschool Education	18	22.	Child Care	24
9.	Achievement Scores	19	23.	Homeless Children	24
10.	SAT Scores	20	24.	Public Assistance Payments	25
11.	Student/Teacher Ratio	20	25.	Hungry Children	25
12.	Per Pupil Expenditures	20	26.	Child Support	26
13.	Child Abuse/Neglect	20	27.	Children in Poverty	26
14.	Children in Foster Care	21			

VIII. Data Appendix 27

IX. Acknowledgements 28

Photographs by Nita Winter. Done in conjunction with the Bay Area Women's Resource Center © 1989 Nita Winter

1.

The Children And Parents Behind The Numbers

A Report Card is filled with numbers and grades. But the real meaning of this report lies in the everyday lives of the children and families of California. It is their stories that are reflected in these statistics.

A statistic about poverty is really about a young father struggling to give his children the basics many of us take for granted.

"No, there never is enough money at the end of the month so we just get by at the end. I make sure the boys eat and they get food at school, too. The worst are birthdays. All the boys have birthdays in the summer and when I have to buy ice cream and cookies and try to make three parties -- I just never can do it. Last year I thought if I make one party for all three boys at the same time, it would be easier. But then it didn't feel like each was special and I think they felt bad."

As a single father raising three sons, Jose struggles to make his salary stretch far enough to handle basic necessities. Jose works full time as a warehouseman, earning almost $6.00 an hour. His after tax paycheck is less than $900 a month. With more than 50% of his salary going toward rent, Jose juggles the balance to cover food, clothing, medical and other expenses.

-- Excerpted from interviews conducted by Fern Tiger Associates

© 1989 for the California Children's Council

A statistic about inadequate health care is really about a little four-year-old girl who nearly lost her hearing.

"So many children in our child care center come here with medical problems that are preventable. Lila, a four-year-old little girl, is typical. Lila and her parents are homeless. She attends our children's center while her father works. Her mother is mildly retarded. Her parents have no health insurance and cannot afford to pay the doctor's bills. So Lila hasn't been to see a doctor, except to get her shots.

"One day her ear began to bleed while she was at the center. If she had been able to go see a doctor when her ear started to hurt, the doctor would probably have discovered that she had an ear infection and treated it before it became too bad. By the time Lila was seen at the hospital, her eardrum had burst. Luckily she got medical help before her ear became even worse. But, she is really lucky to still have her hearing in that ear.

"Most of our children have never seen a doctor. Too many of them come here with problems like Lila's that could have been prevented. So much of their suffering is altogether avoidable."

-- Staff of A Child Care Center

A statistic of young people failing in school and taking drugs is really about a teenager lost to gangs.

"I am nothing to the world, but I'm something to my homeboys. When I was little I used to be an 'A' student. When I started going to junior high, I felt lonely. I ended up cutting school, selling drugs. The school looked at my record as I went from being an 'A' student to an 'F'. I was hooked and needed help. I ended up in a hospital for suicide.

"I think being in a gang is worth it only if you got nothing else. If I had one wish it would be that I should never gave up...[I should have] stayed in school, not let them pressure me. I guess I didn't get love at home but I get it in the streets. Wrong love. Wrong love is still love."

-- George, teenage gangmember

II.

OVERVIEW

THE CHILDREN OF CALIFORNIA

Today, Californians stand at an unprecedented crossroads in deciding what the future of our children will be. The facts about the conditions of children in the Golden State are stark and sobering:

- One in five children in California lives in poverty ($11,650 or less annual income for a family of four).
- One third do not graduate from high school.
- California has the second highest rate of teenage pregnancy in the country.
- California locks up juveniles at a rate twice the national average.

For decades, California led the nation as a state with a strong commitment to children and families. The state's health and education systems were heralded as models for other states.

Recently, things have changed. California has experienced an era of tax and spending limits and reductions in children's services. Yet, at the same time, the number of children in California has grown dramatically, and their needs have increased. California is now home to 7.6 million children -- one out of every nine children in the United States.

These children cannot vote. They do not sit in executive board rooms, nor do they have dozens of lobbyists or media specialists promoting their interests. Children have been largely unseen and unheard, and they have been disproportionately affected by reductions in public and private resources. Only 50% of California's young children are now adequately immunized; cutbacks have affected children's health and education programs as well as parks, libraries, and after-school programs that serve them.

The good news is that California is one of the richest, most advanced states in the world. We know how to provide children with the proper health care, a high quality education, and solid values.

"California: The State of Our Children" is a Report Card and Briefing Book for the citizens of California. We believe that if Californians understand the needs of children and the clear cost-benefits of investing in the next generations, they will respond.

MEASURING SUCCESS: ACCOUNTABILITY FOR CHILDREN

Accountability in spending and performance is something we all expect -- whether as tax-paying citizens, business leaders, or parents. As a society, we diligently monitor the well-being of our economy through measures like the Consumer Price Index and the Gross National Product. It only makes sense to expect the same accountability and positive performance regarding the well-being of California's children and families.

It is important that we, as a state, devise an objective way to measure how our children are doing. We recognize there are many ways to accomplish this, and we offer this Report Card as a first step. It provides a set of statistical measures called "Children's Benchmarks" -- such as infant mortality, high school graduation rates, hunger and homelessness among children, and births to teenagers. Together these Children's Benchmarks paint a comprehensive picture of our children's well-being -- a picture that can be tracked and monitored over time.

Why We Wrote This Report Card

The Report Card and Briefing Book are intended to inform Californians about how well children are faring. The Briefing Book also describes what can be done to make California a "Class A" state for children and families. Like the report cards school children receive, this Report Card is meant to:

- ▲Measure performance
- ▲Help identify progress as well as areas that need improvement
- ▲Serve as a catalyst to improve achievement.

We also hope this Report will be used as a tool for the public and policymakers to invest in children and families more effectively over the next decade.

Focus On Outcomes

In devising this Report Card, we looked at information from a children's perspective. Instead of trying to assess the amount of effort made to help children or the dollars spent on their behalf, we looked at actual measures of the well-being of children. The grades, therefore, are designed to measure the results of our efforts for children, not the effort made.

The Building Momentum

We issue this report at a time when momentum is starting to build to make California, again, a leader on behalf of children and families. A recent Children Now poll* found that 77% of California's voters think children are facing a crisis; two-thirds (69%) think children should be the first priority for state government spending; and an extraordinary 96% think California should rank in the top 10 states in caring for children.

* Greenberg-Lake: The Analysis Group conducted a statewide telephone survey of California voters between May 3 and May 7, 1989. Results are available from Children Now.

Business leaders have begun to recognize the importance of helping children get a good start in life: The Committee for Economic Development (225 corporate executive officers from across the nation) issued a groundbreaking report, "Children In Need," and growing numbers of businesses are recognizing the cost-effectiveness of family-oriented benefits. A host of dedicated parents and conscientious professionals work hard every day, to voice the needs of children in a changing society and to build a legacy of successful programs for children.

Elected officials and candidates running for office understand that voters are concerned, and they are beginning to exercise leadership on behalf of children. Policy analysts are producing the needed facts about the conditions of children in California, including those contained in recent reports by Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE) and The Task Force on the Changing Family.

What's In This Report

- ▲**The 1989 Report Card and Its Major Findings:** A summary of how California's children are faring in the areas of health, education, safety, teen years, and investing in families.
- ▲**The Cost of Neglect:** An assessment of what it will cost Californians if we continue to let the needs of our children slide.
- ▲**Making California a "Class A" State for Children:** An action agenda, with long-term recommendations as well as immediate opportunities for achieving higher marks for children.
- ▲**A Guide to the Children's Benchmarks:** A quick reference, summarizing key facts about each of the 27 Children's Benchmarks on which the grades in this Report Card are based.

III.

Report Card At A Glance

A Call To Action

There are three major conclusions from this first-ever Report Card on the well-being of California's children:

- Although California can be proud of its accomplishments for children in certain areas, California's grades are discouraging and getting worse in many areas. The Report Card sends a strong warning signal to Californians about the health and well-being of children.

- California is a truly unique place for children to grow up. The sheer number of children in California, their rich racial and ethnic diversity, and the higher cost for a family to live in California make our state one-of-a-kind. These factors also make it a greater challenge for California to ensure a good and healthy start for children.

- The Report Card is a resounding call to action for everyone in this state. As sobering as many of the findings in this Report Card are, it is clear Californians have the resources and expertise to improve the lives of children.

REPORT CARD '89	
EDUCATION	C
HEALTH	C
SAFETY	U
TEEN YEARS	D-
INVESTING IN FAMILIES	D+
OVERALL GRADE	D

Grading California

California's grades are based on statistical data for 27 different health, education, and other measurable indicators of children's well-being. Each Children's Benchmark was analyzed to see if the situation for children in California is:

- Getting better or worse
- Better or worse than the national average
- Ranked in the top 10 best states.

The actual method for assigning grades and further details about interpreting the Report Card information are found in Part VII and in the Data Appendix at the back of this report.

Explanation of Grades

A=Excellent

B=Good

C=Needs Improvement

D=Seriously Deficient

U=Unsatisfactory

"In the business and sports worlds, all of us place a premium on results. This Report Card makes it clear that all Californians need to work together for better results for children."

--- Peter V. Ueberroth

California's Grade Overall: D

The Report Card measures California's performance on these 27 indicators:

HEALTH

1. Infant Mortality
2. Late or No Prenatal Care
3. Inadequate Immunization
4. Uninsured Children
5. Use of Nutrition Program
6. Children's Mental Health

EDUCATION

7. Graduation Rates
8. Preschool Education
9. Achievement Scores
10. SAT Scores
11. Student/Teacher Ratio
12. Per Pupil Expenditures

SAFETY

13. Child Abuse/Neglect
14. Children in Foster Care
15. Drug-Exposed Babies
16. Youth Homicides

TEEN YEARS

17. College-Bound Students
18. Unemployed Youth
19. Teen Births
20. Drugs/Alcohol
21. Incarcerated Juveniles

INVESTING IN FAMILIES

22. Child Care
23. Homeless Children
24. Public Assistance Payments
25. Hungry Children
26. Child Support
27. Children in Poverty

These facts emerged (in some areas data are not available, so all 27 benchmarks cannot be assessed for each catagory):

- **California has gotten worse:** On 11 of 21 Benchmarks (52%), California's performance has gotten worse over the last few years.
- **California's performance is worse than the nation's:** On 14 of 18 Benchmarks (78%), California is worse than the national average.
- **California is not in the 10 best states:** On 11 of 14 Benchmarks (79%), California fails to be among the 10 best states.
- **Incompletes:** For 6 of 27 important Benchmarks (22%), the available information is incomplete, and performance cannot be assessed.

These statistics are about all children in California. They sometimes mask far more serious problems among certain groups. For example:

- **Poverty:** National studies show that poverty is perhaps the most significant factor in determining the health, education, and future of a child. While 21% of all California's children are poor, 29% of Black and 34% of Latino children in the state are poor.
- **Graduation Rates:** Although 32% of California's 10th graders do not graduate from high school in three years, the figure is 45% for Latino and 48% for Black students.
- **Foster Care:** The number of children under age five in foster care increased 120% between 1983 and 1988. Children under age 5 now represent more than 1/3 of all children in foster care.

IV.

The Costs Of Neglect

Each day, the newspapers remind us of how the neglect of children affects us all. Increasingly, job applicants do not have the reading, writing, or analytic skills to succeed at the jobs that are available, let alone the skills necessary for the jobs of the 21st century. Drugs and gangs in school, neighborhood shootings, and teens killed while they or their friends drive under the influence of alcohol touch too many of our lives. And all Californians face the prospect of depending on a generation unable to support the Social Security system.

Right now Californians are also paying a high price in tax dollars as more and more children, failed by the lack of preventive services and lack of opportunities, face a life of welfare, unproductive work, and crime. California's voters understand the choices involved. The Children Now poll revealed that when asked, "Which of the following statements comes closer to your view?":

6% agreed with this statement:
"We do not have enough money to improve programs for children in Californian right now."

88% agreed with this statement:
"If we do not invest in children now, we will pay a much higher price later for the cost of job training, welfare, and prisons."

Choices for Spending Tax Dollars

1 **Preventive Health Care vs. Hospital Care for Avoidable Children's Health Problems** -- It costs approximately $1,200 in California to provide necessary health care for a pregnant woman. It typically costs an average of $20,000 (and as much as $1 million) to care for a sick newborn whose life begins in a hospital intensive care unit because of health problems that prenatal care could have prevented.

2 **Child Care vs. Welfare** -- Full-day child care costs about $3,500 per year for a preschool child whose mother is a single head of household and needs to work. (Some of these parents can share in the cost, and lower their subsidy.) If the mother cannot work because she cannot find or afford child care, welfare and medical payments for that same mother and her child are $8,750 per year.

3 **Providing Preventive Support Services to A Family "At Risk" for Abuse or Neglect vs. Putting a Child in a Foster Family Home or Group Home** -- It costs about $3,000 to provide a family at risk of abuse or neglect with intensive counselling, respite child care, or other in-home services which can prevent the problems from becoming severe. If the problems are neglected and become so serious that the child cannot stay at home, it costs about $5,500 each year to keep that child in a foster family home, and approximately $31,000 each year for placement in a group home.

4 **Treating Troubled Youth Before They Become More Troubled vs. Locking Them Up in the California Youth Authority** -- It costs $24,500 each year to keep a juvenile offender locked up in the California Youth Authority, the state's institutions for severely troubled youth. Many of these juveniles could be helped by community-based programs at a cost of $7,000 annually, if this option were available before their problems became too severe. The savings could pay for the college education of these youth.

V.

MAKING CALIFORNIA A "CLASS A" STATE

"We know how to use public policy to benefit children and to save billions of dollars in long-term costs. Yet these proven programs fail to reach millions of eligible children and families who urgently need services. In some cases, we have not even kept pace with the current need..."

-- The U. S. House of Representatives
Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families,
"Opportunities for Success, Cost-Effective Programs for Children, Update, 1988"

An impressive array of evidence, from California and throughout the country, documents that well-conceived, targeted programs for children improve their health and well-being, reduce the long-term costs of caring for them, and increase their ultimate happiness and productivity.

There is a growing consensus: we must build on the cost-effective programs that work, but which now serve only a fraction of the children who need them. In California these include:

- ▲The nearly 50% of young children who are not adequately immunized -- even though $1 invested in immunization saves $10 in medical costs.
- ▲The estimated 75% of children eligible for early childhood education who do not receive these services in California -- even though $1 invested in pre school education returns $6 in lower costs for special education, repeated grades, public assistance, and crime.
- ▲The estimated 90% of pregnant teens who need special services to help them stay in school and become effective parents, but who do not now receive these services. Californians pay an estimated $3 billion each year in public support for families in which the mother had her first child as a teenager and typically did not finish school.

- ▲The rapidly growing number of children in families who might never have faced abuse, neglect, and a life time in foster care had their parents received needed in-home support services. In the past year alone, state expenditures for foster care increased approximately 20% in California.
- ▲The 67% of needy young children and pregnant women who qualify for, but are not now served by, California's program of nutrition supplements -- even though the WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) Program saves as much as $3 in short-term hospital costs for every $1 invested.

Unlike so many other complicated social problems, improving the lives of children is within our reach. Californians have the know-how and the resources to raise these grades.

VI.

An Agenda For Action: The Right Start

Long-Term Goals for Every Child

As a **long-term goal**, we recommend that Californians work together to ensure that every child in the state gets the Right Start, including:

A Good Beginning: Through early health care, early childhood education, and a variety of supporting programs for parents and families.

The Basics: Including nutritious food, secure shelter, safety from abuse and neglect, and an enriching home environment.

Opportunities for Economic Independence: Through quality education, job training, and economic opportunities as well as programs for pregnant teenagers, juvenile offenders, and other at-risk youth.

A Partnership Approach

Long-term and short-term goals for children can best be accomplished through a working partnership among government, businesses, parents, service providers, and volunteers. The Children Now poll showed that 83% of voters believe that only when there is such a partnership "can we really do something to help children in California."

Getting Started: Immediate Opportunities in 1989

As a shorter-term agenda, we recommend starting with the first part of the Right Start plan -- ensuring a good beginning for young children. More specifically we urge Californians to:

1 Improve the Health of California's Youngest Children

Uninsured Children: Twenty-five percent of the funds from the new Prop 99 cigarette tax revenues (designated to expand health services for the indigent) should be spent to reach more of California's uninsured young children with preventive health check-ups and treatment ($100 million in Fiscal Year 1989/90).

Babies and Mothers: The state of California should immediately put to use nearly $8 million in unspent federal funds that are now available and have been designated for maternal and child health programs. They should be used to expand prenatal and child health clinics in California.

The Private Sector: Business and corporate leaders should help develop health programs for their employees' children and for poor and at-risk children in the community.

2 Expand Child Care, Including Early Childhood Education

California should develop a step-by-step plan for expanding child care, including early childhood education, so that 10% of the unmet need is reached each year. By the year 2000, California would have a statewide system capable of providing early childhood education to needy 3, 4, and 5-year-olds. This system should be developed through a partnership including the corporate sector along with federal, state, and local governments. The Senate Office of Research estimates this action would reach an additional 40,000 needy children each year at an annual cost of $100 million.

3 Invest in Families

California should develop a statewide program of in-home preventive services for families at risk of abuse and neglect. Such services are now available in three model counties, and there is widespread agreement that converting the model to a statewide program would help children and families -- and save money in the long run. Under the current plan, counties receive 10% of their foster care funds at the beginning of the year to pay for preventive alternatives to foster care placements. Counties are expected to meet certain outcome standards, and they face the threat of reduced state funding if their goals are not met.

Experts believe that this prevention program will initially pay for itself out of the savings it generates. Over time, a statewide prevention program will be far less expensive than current projections of rapidly rising foster care expenses.

4 Help Families Help Themselves

Community education and outreach campaigns should be launched to help working parents use the federal Earned Income Tax Credit. This federal work incentive allows working families (with at least one child at home and an annual income less than $18,750) to receive a refundable credit of up to $875, even if they owe no income tax. By simply filing a federal tax return, parents struggling to make ends meet on a limited family budget can get earned financial help for necessities like child care, clothing, or health care.

5 Develop the Necessary Information to Improve the Lives of California's Children and to Monitor Progress

Setting Goals for Children: California should establish a clear method of ensuring accountability to our children. First, we must agree on appropriate children's benchmarks for measuring progress, and then we must set reasonable goals for where we, as a state, want our children to be by the years 1995, 2000, and beyond.

Regular Reports on Progress -- The State: State officials should report on progress toward meeting the benchmarks for children, determine how poor and minority children are faring according to these benchmarks, and obtain needed information that is not now available.

Regular Reports on Progress -- Counties and Cities: Counties and cities should also develop concrete goals and methods of accountability for children's needs. Under the recently passed Prop 98 Education Initiative, every school district is required to adopt an annual "School Accountability Report Card" for each school in the district. A broader assessment of children's well-being, using the Children's Benchmarks from this report, would be a logical and important companion to these required report cards on schools -- especially because the "non-school" benchmarks relate so closely to how children perform in school.

VII.

A Guide To The Facts: Children's Benchmarks

"The printing of comparative statistics of infant mortality is often followed by a reduction of the death rates of babies. Municipal officials and voters did not have before publication a place in their picture of the environment for those babies. The statistics make them visible as if the babies had elected an alderman to air their grievances."

-- "Reflections of America: Commentary" by Walter Lippman, 1922

The remainder of this report is intended as a quick and handy reference, summarizing key facts about each of the 27 Children's Benchmarks which form the basis for the grades on the Report Card. We urge readers to use these facts for speeches, news articles, presentations, and other efforts to educate the public about the needs of California's children. We have included a comprehensive set of benchmarks to encourage readers and policymakers to focus on the total picture of children, rather than on any one measure alone. Children's needs are interrelated and cannot be viewed as isolated, separate pieces.

CHILDREN'S BENCHMARKS CHART

The summary "Benchmark" chart provides an overview of the **27** indicators used to evaluate California's performance for children.

Indicator	Trend In California	Compared To National Avg.	Rank: Among Ten Best States?
Children's Health			
1. Infant Mortality	Better*	Better	Yes (8th
2. Late or No Prenatal Care	Worse	Better	No (36th)
3. Inadequate Immunization	Better	Worse	NA
4. Uninsured Children	Worse	Worse	NA
5. Use of Nutrition Program	Better	Worse	No (45th)
6. Children's Mental Health	Incomplete	NA	NA
Children's Education			
7. Graduation Rates	Worse*	Worse	No (42nd)
8. Preschool Education	Incomplete	NA	NA
9. Achievement Scores	Better	NA	NA
10. SAT Scores	Better	Better	Yes (4th of 22)
11. Student/Teacher Ratio	Better	Worse	No (50th)
12. Per Pupil Expenditures	Better	Worse	No (30th)
Children's Safety			
13. Child Abuse/Neglect	Worse	Worse	No (48th)
14. Children In Foster Care	Worse	Worse	NA
15. Drug Exposed Babies	Incomplete	NA	NA
16. Youth Homicides	Worse*	Worse	NA
Teen Years And Beyond			
17. College Bound Students	Worse*	Worse	NA
18. Unemployed Youth	Better	Worse	No (33rd)
19. Teen Births	Worse	Worse	No (23rd)
20. Drugs/Alcohol	Better	NA	NA
21. Incarcerated Juveniles	Worse	Worse	No (50th)
Investing In Families			
22. Child Care	Incomplete	NA	NA
23. Homeless Children	Incomplete	NA	NA
24. Public Assistance Payments	Better	NA	Yes (1st)
25. Hungry Children	Incomplete	NA	NA
26. Child Support	Worse	Better	No (14 of 42)
27. Children in Poverty	Worse	Worse	No (35th)

Trends are based on the most recent four years of information. When no clear trend emerges, data from additional years are analyzed. An (*) indicates that the trend is based on five years. Ranks are out of a possible 51 (including 50 states and the District of Columbia) with #1 being best and 51 being worst. For a more detailed discussion about how the information for this chart was assembled, see the Data Appendix at the back of this report.

NA = Information not available.
Incomplete = Available data is incomplete, so no trend can be determined.

CHILDREN'S BENCHMARKS

CHILDREN'S HEALTH

1 INFANT MORTALITY

Refers to: The number of infants who die in their first year of life per 1,000 live births.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
9.8	9.7	9.3	9.7	8.9

(Note: The 1986 figure is "provisional".)

▲ **National Average:** 10.4 in 1986
● **State Rank:** 8th in 1986
■ **Notable Facts:** California's infant mortality rate for Black infants (16.2) was nearly twice the rate for all Californians in 1986. California's infant mortality rate increased in 1985 (the first increase in 20 years) which ended a consistent downward trend that began in 1965.

Sources: California State Department of Health Services, Birth Cohort Records, 1982-86; Children's Defense Fund, *The Health of America's Children: Maternal and Child Health Data Book*, (Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund 1989); Southern California Child Health Network and the Children's Research Institute of California, *Back to Basics 1988: Strategies for Investing in the Health of California's Next Generation*, (Santa Monica, CA: Southern California Child Health Network 1988).

2 LATE OR NO PRENATAL CARE

Refers to: The percentage of women whose prenatal care began in the third trimester, who received no care, or whose time of entry into care was unknown.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1983	1984	1985	1986
6.9%	7.1%	7.5%	7.3%

▲ **National Average:** 8.1% in 1986
● **State Rank:** 36th in 1986 (based only on women who received third trimester care or no care at all.)
■ **Notable Facts:** Compared to babies whose mothers receive adequate prenatal care, babies whose mothers receive no prenatal care are four times as likely to die in their first year of life and three times as likely to be born at dangerously low birthweight. It costs approximately $1200 for complete prenatal care, compared to an average of $19,000 for a baby who begins life in a hospital intensive care unit for a problem that prenatal care could have prevented.

Sources: Children's Defense Fund, *The Health of America's Children: Maternal and Child Health Data Book* (Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund 1989); Southern California Child Health Network and the Children's Research Institute of California, *Back to Basics: Improving the Health of California's Next Generation* (Santa Monica, CA: Southern California Child Health Network 1987); State of California, Vital Statistics, 1983-1986.

INADEQUATE IMMUNIZATION

Refers to: The percentage of 2 year olds who are not fully immunized for DTP. (Diphtheria, Tetanus, and Pertussis).

CALIFORNIA TREND

1985	1986	1987	1988
52.6%	49.1%	44.6%	47.9%

▲ **National Average:** 44.3% in 1985
● **State Rank:** Not Available
■ **Notable Facts:** A 1985 California study showed that only 25% of Black and Latino children were adequately immunized at 2 years of age.

Sources: Center for Disease Control, "National Immunization Survey", (Atlanta, GA: CDC 1985); California State Department of Health Services, Immunization Unit, Survey of Kindergarten Children, 1988; Policy Analysis for California Education, *Conditions of Children in California*, Berkeley, CA: (University of California, Berkeley: 1989).

UNINSURED CHILDREN

Refers to: The percentage of children under age 18 who have no health insurance coverage through public or private programs.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1983	1984	1985	1986
19.9%	20.3%	22.5%	21.6%

▲ **National Average:** 18.9% in 1986
● **State Rank:** Not available
■ **Notable Facts:** Approximately 1.6 million children in California were uninsured in 1986. Fifteen percent of all Anglo children in California were uninsured compared to 29.1% of all Black children, 33.3% of all Latino children, and 13.3% of all Asian children.

Sources: E. Richard Brown, R. Burciaga Valdez, Hal Morgenstern, "Changes in Health Insurance Coverage Of Californians, 1979-1986", (Berkeley, CA: California Policy Seminar, University of California and California State Government 1988); Children's Defense Fund, *The Health of America's Children: Maternal and Child Health Data Book* (Washington, D.C.: 1989).

USE OF NUTRITION PROGRAM

Refers to: The number and percentage of mothers and children eligible for nutrition supplements through the Women, Infants and Children Program (WIC) who receive those benefits. WIC provides high-protein food supplements to pregnant women and young children who are low income and at "nutritional risk".

CALIFORNIA TREND

1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89
254,050	254,548	300,682	395,000
22.3%	22.2%	24.8%	32.5%

(The 1988-89 figure is based on the number of pregnant women and children served as of April, 1989).

▲ **National Average:** 49.2% in 1988 (The method to determine the national percentage is slightly different from that used for the state figures: national eligibility counts are based on 185% of the federal poverty level and take health risks into account; the California count is based on 200% of the federal poverty level and does not take health risks into account.)
● **State Rank:** 45th in 1988
■ **Notable Facts:** Evaluations of the WIC program have shown that each dollar spent on the prenatal care component of the program saves three dollars in hospital costs. The monthly cost of food supplements for a mother or child using WIC in California is $36.00.

Sources: Children's Defense Fund, *The Health of America's Children: Maternal and Child Health Data Book* (Washington, D.C.: 1989); Children's Defense Fund, *A Vision for America's Future* (Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund 1989); California State WIC Office, Sacramento, CA 1989; U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Children,Youth, and Families, "Opportunities For Success: Cost Effective Programs for Children, Update 1988", (Washington, D.C.: 1988)

MENTAL HEALTH

Refers to: The percentage of children under age 18 who need mental health services and receive them.

CALIFORNIA TREND

There are no annual figures for the number of children in California needing mental health services or for the total number served by programs.

Applying the national prevalence estimates of children with mental health problems, which range from 5 - 15%, approximately 378,000 to 1,140,000 of California's 7.6 million children are within the range of need. In 1986/87, 61,000 children received mental health services in California's public programs -- an estimated 5 -16% of the need. No data are available regarding children treated in the private sector.

▲ **National Average:** Between 7.5 and 9.5 million children in the United States under age 18 suffer from mental problems severe enough to require treatment. An estimated 70-80% of emotionally disturbed children get inappropriate mental health services or no services at all.

● **State Rank:** Not Available

■ **Notable Facts:** Children receive approximately 17.5% of mental health services provided by California's public mental health system. Anglo children receive 56% of the children's services provided, Latinos 21%, Blacks 16%, and Asians/other 7 %. There are only 1,003 psychiatric treatment beds operated by the California public mental health system. California's rate of youth suicide is slightly lower than the national rate (2.6 for California compared to 3.0 nationally per 100,000 youth under age 19).

Sources: California State Department of Mental Health Client Data System May 1989; Office of Technology Assessment, "Children's Mental Health: Promising Responses to Neglected Problems", (Washington D.C.: 1986); Policy Analysis for California Education, *Conditions of Children in California* (Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley 1989); U.S Department of Health and Human Services, National Center for Health Statistics, unpublished data.

CHILDREN'S EDUCATION

GRADUATION RATES

Refers to: High School graduates as a percentage of 10th grade enrollment three years earlier.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1983/84	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88
69.5%	68.1%	68.3%	67.3%	67.8%

▲ **National Average:** 71.1% in 1987 (The method for calculating the national percentage is slightly different from the method California uses: the national figure takes into account children who move out of state and children who are handicapped and in special education programs, while the California figures do not. However, both the national approach, when applied to California, and California's approach show California's graduation rates to be lower than the national average.)

● **State Rank:** 42nd in 1987

■ **Notable Facts:** In 1987, 48% of Black students and 45% of Latinos did not graduate in California, compared to 32% of all students.

Sources: California State Department of Education, California Basic Educational Data System, Sacramento, CA, May 1989; Kati Haycock and Susana Navarro, *Unfinished Business: Fulfilling Our Children's Promises* (Oakland, CA: The Achievement Council, May 1988); U.S. Department of Education, "State Education Performance Chart", (Washington, D.C.: Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation 1989).

PRESCHOOL EDUCATION
(EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION)

Refers to: The number and percentage of 3, 4, and 5-year olds who receive early childhood education, like through the Head Start program. In California, low income youngsters receive such early childhood education through a variety of programs, some of which are full-day and some part-day.

CALIFORNIA TREND

Numbers to determine the percentage of all children receiving preschool education are not available.

Similarly, regarding low income children, the percentage of eligible children who receive preschool education cannot be determined because of lack of data.

However, a rough estimate shows that approximately 92,000 needy children receive early childhood education through a combination of part-day and full-day programs, including:

- Approximately 21,240 young children served by California's State Preschool Program (based on a survey by the State Department of Education in 1985-86);
- An additional 35,170 young children receiving preschool education through other state-funded child development programs;
- An estimated 35,360 children served by Head Start in 1989. (There may be some overlap between the number of children in Head Start and other child development programs, but the overlap cannot be determined with available data.)

Data are not available to determine the extent of the unmet need for preschool education in California; there is no annual count of the number of children aged 3 to 5 who qualify for preschool education each year based on their families' income. Perhaps the best proxy measure is Head Start -- a program which serves an estimated 20% of eligible children in California.

State appropriations for the State Preschool Program have barely kept pace with inflation.

1982-83	1984-85	1986-87	1988-89
$30,269	$34,104	$35,604	$37,285

▲ **National Average:** In 1987, 18.5% of children eligible for Head Start nationally received its services.

● **State Rank:** Not available.

■ **Notable Facts:** $1 invested in preschool education saves $6 in lowered costs for special education, repeated years in school, welfare, and crime.

Sources: California Legislative Analyst Office, *The Child Development Program: A Sunset Report* (Sacramento, CA: Feb. 1989); California State Department of Education, "Triennial Report On Publicly Funded Child Development Programs 1985-86", (Sacramento, CA: SDE, Program Evaluation and Research Division 1988); Children's Defense Fund, *A Vision for America's Future*, (Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund 1989); U.S. House of Representatives, Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, "Opportunities for Success: Cost-Effective Programs for Children Update, Washington, D.C., 1988".

ACHIEVEMENT SCORES

Refers to: CAP Scores (California Assessment Program) for 6th and 8th grade students (achievement tests administered to all 3rd, 6th 8th and 12th grade students). A potential perfect score is 500, with the typical range of 100 to 400.

CALIFORNIA TREND

	1985	1986	1987	1988
6th Grade				
Reading	253	260	260	265
Math	264	268	268	270
8th Grade				
Reading	240	243	247	252
Math	251	253	259	264

▲ **National Average:** Not Available

● **State Rank:** Not Available

■ **Notable Facts:** In 1988, 6th grade Latino students scored 64 points below Anglo students in Reading and 57 points below in Math; Black students scored 65 points below Anglo students in Reading and 67 points below in Math; Asian students scored 14 points below Anglo students in Reading and 16 points above in Math.

Sources: California State Department of Education, "The Four Year School and District Summary, 1987-88" (Sacramento, CA: SDE, California Assessment Program, Oct. 1988).

SAT SCORES

Refers to: The average combined math and verbal SAT score (out of a possible 1600) of high school students taking the test.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1985	1986	1987	1988
904	904	906	908

▲ **National Average:** 904 in 1988
● **State Rank:** Tied for 4th of 22 states in 1988
■ **Notable Facts:** In 1988, Mexican-American students scored 153 points below and Black students scored 200 points below Anglo students in California.

Sources: College Board, "1988 Profile of SAT and Achievement Test-Takers", (Princeton, N.J.: 1988); U.S. Department of Education, "State Education Performance Chart", (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education 1986-1989).

STUDENT/TEACHER RATIO

Refers to: The number of pupils for every one teacher in California's public schools.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1985	1986	1987	1988
23.3	23.1	23.0	22.9

▲ **National Average:** 17.6 in 1988
● **State Rank:** 50th in 1988
■ **Notable Facts:** Only the state of Utah has more students for every teacher.

Sources: U. S. Department of Education, "State Education Performance Chart" (Washington, D.C.: USDE, Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation 1986-89).

PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES

Refers To: The average dollar expenditure per pupil in California's public schools. Expenditures in ( ) adjusted by state and local government deflator to reflect actual expenditures in 1984 dollars.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1984	1985	1986	1987
$2,963	$3,256	$3,543	$3,728
($2,963)	($3,108)	($3,258)	($3,325)

▲ **National Average:** $3,977 in 1987
● **State Rank:** 30th in 1987.

Sources: U. S. Department of Education, "State Education Performance Chart" (Washington, D.C.: USDE, Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation 1986-89).

CHILDREN'S SAFETY

CHILD ABUSE/NEGLECT

Refers to: The number of child abuse reports per 1,000 children.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1984	1985	1986	1987
37.6	43.2	48.1	50.8

▲ **National Average:** 34.0 in 1987
● **State Rank:** 48th in 1987
■ **Notable Facts:** Over 370,600 cases of child abuse were reported in California in 1987. Only the states of Nevada, Missouri, and South Dakota have higher reported rates of child abuse than California. According to the California Department of Justice, which reports on the most serious cases of abuse, cases of abuse increased 135% between 1980 and 1988. In 1988, nearly 96 child deaths were attributed to physical abuse, neglect, sexual abuse, or emotional maltreatment.

Sources: The American Humane Association and the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, *Highlights of Official Aggregate Child Neglect and Abuse Reporting, 1987*, (Denver, CO: American Humane Association 1989); California State Department of Justice, Bureau of Criminal Statistics,

Child Abuse Unit, 1989; National Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse, " Child Abuse Fatalities Continue to Rise: The Results of the 1988 Annual 50-State Survey", (Chicago, IL: NCPCA, March 1989).

CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE

Refers to: The number of and rate (per 1,000) of children under 18 years of age who are in out-of-home/substitute care, including children in foster care, children placed out of their home with relatives, and children on probation who are not in institutionalized care (e.g. California Youth Authority, county camps, etc.). The data are collected at the end of each month for all counties.

CALIFORNIA TREND

April 1986	April 1987	April 1988	April 1989
47,021	52,231	59,676	67,687
6.8	7.4	8.2	8.9

▲ **National Average:** In 1988, an estimated 300,000 children nationwide -- a rate of 4.7 per 1,000 children under age 18 -- were living in substitute care.

● **State Rank:** Not Available

■ **Notable Facts:** The number of California's children under age 5 in foster care increased from approximately 10,000 in 1983 to 22,000 in 1988--a 120% increase. Children under age 5 now account for 34% of California's foster children. Black children comprise an increasing portion of foster children-- 35% in 1988. up from 27% in 1983. The average length of time children spend in foster care increased 33% between 1987 and 1989, from 15 months to 20 months. Fifty-nine percent of children in foster care are from families eligible for Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC). General Fund expenditures have increased dramatically in the past five years ($170.5 million in 1983-84 to $528 million in the 1989-90 budget year) due to the increase in the foster care caseload.

Sources: California Legislative Analyst Office, *Analysis of the 1989-90 Budget Bill* (Sacramento, CA: LAO 1989); California State Department of Social Services, Foster Care Information System, Doc. SOC158A; California Tomorrow, "Report and Analysis of the State Foster Care/Child Welfare System," Upcoming, 1989; Dr. Toshi Tatara, The American Public Welfare Association, Washington, D.C., unpublished data 1989.

DRUG-EXPOSED BABIES

Refers to: The percentage of newborn infants who are born exposed to illicit drugs.

CALIFORNIA TREND

No statewide statistics are available. Experts estimate that between 17,000 and 30,000 babies are born drug-exposed in California -- 3-6% of babies born each year. Public hospitals in Los Angeles, Oakland, and San Francisco report 10-25% of births with positive urine toxicology screens for illicit substances. Survey information from throughout the state shows that the problem is growing.

▲ **National Average:** National statistics are not available, but a sample survey of 36 hospitals across the country showed that 11% of births had a positive toxicology screen for illicit drugs. Experts estimate 375,000 babies will be born drug-exposed this year in the United States. One national survey found that the majority of hospitals reported having no place to send pregnant women for drug treatment.

● **State Rank:** Not available

■ **Notable Facts:** The California Department of Health Services estimates these drug-exposed babies require an additional $178 million in health costs annually; other experts have estimated the costs to California at between $500 million to $1 billion annually. Los Angeles County registered an 1100% increase in the placement of drug-exposed infants and children between 1981 and 1987. In Alameda County, nearly 70% of families whose children were placed in foster care had histories of substance abuse.

Sources: California State Legislative Analyst Office, *The 1989-90 Budget: Perspectives and Issues* , (Sacramento, CA: LAO 1989); Testimony by Dr. Neal Halfon, Director, Center for the Vulnerable Child, before the House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, (Washington, D.C.: April 27 1989); U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, "Survey of Drug Exposed Infants", (Washington D.C.: 1989).

YOUTH HOMICIDES

Refers to: The number and rate of victims of homicide crimes per 100,000 persons under 20 years of age.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
381	395	386	459	456
5.1	5.2	5.0	5.7	5.6

▲ **National Average:** 4.1 in 1986
● **State Rank:** Not Available
■ **Notable Facts:** In 1987, Black youth constituted 42% of all youth homicides; 33% were Latino youth, 20% were Anglo youth in California and 5% were other. The Department of Justice reported 136 gang-related homicides among youth under 20 years old, an increase of 72% since 1983.

Sources: California Office of the Attorney General, *Homicide in California, 1987*, (Sacramento, CA: State Department of Justice, Bureau of Criminal Statistics 1987).

TEEN YEARS AND BEYOND

COLLEGE-BOUND STUDENTS

Refers to: The percentage of high school graduates under 20 years old who enroll in 2 and 4 year colleges and universities within California.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
57.2%	56.0%	53.7%	57.8%	56.2%

▲ **National Average:** 56.8% in 1987. (The method to determine the national average is slightly different from the state figures: the national average is based on high school students who graduated between January and October of 1987, are ages 16 - 24, and are enrolled in 2 and 4 year colleges.)
● **State Rank:** Not Available
■ **Noteable Facts:** In 1987, 45% of Black high school graduates went on to California's public colleges or universities (UC, State University, or Community Colleges). For Latino students, the percentage was 37%; 61% for Asians. In California, the majority of high school students going on to college enter 2 year colleges (61%), compared to 59% of students nationally.

Sources: California Postsecondary Education Commission, *California College-Going Rates* (Sacramento, CA: 1989); Unpublished data from "School Enrollment Supplement to Current Population Survey," Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, October 1987.

UNEMPLOYED YOUTH

Refers to: The number and percentage of 16 to 19 year-olds who are actively looking for work but unemployed.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1985	1986	1987	1988
156,000	141,000	140,000	134,000
20.1%	18.1%	16.9%	15.7%

▲ **National Average:** 15.3% in 1988 (1,226,000).
● **State Rank:** 33rd in 1988
■ **Notable Facts:** In 1987, the rate of unemployment for Black youths in California was 22.3% (13,000) and 19.8% (41,000) for Latino youths.

Sources: Unpublished data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, "Geographic Profiles of Employment and Unemployment", 1986-1988, and "Unemployment in States and Local Areas", 1984-85; Children's Defense Fund, *A Vision for America's Future*, (Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund 1989).

TEEN BIRTH RATE

Refers to: The number of births to females aged 15-19 per 1,000 females of that age.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1983	1984	1985	1986
51.4	51.1	52.5	53.2

▲ **National Average:** 50.6 in 1986
● **State Rank:** 23rd in 1986 (based on the percentage of infants born to women under age 20).
■ **Notable Facts:** California's teen pregnancy rate is the second highest in the nation. There has also been a dramatic increase in California in the proportion of teen mothers who are unmarried -- 62% in 1986, up from 32% in 1970.

Sources: Children's Defense Fund, *The Health of America's Children: Maternal and Child Health Data Book* (Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund 1989); California State Department of Health Services, *Vital Statistics of California 1986*, (Sacramento, CA: DHS, Health and Welfare Agency, April 1988); Claire D. Brindis and Rita J. Jeremy, *Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenting In California*, (San Francisco, CA: University of California, San Francisco, Institute for Health Policy Studies 1988).

20 YOUTH USING DRUGS OR ALCOHOL

Refers to: Percentage of 11th graders using beer, marijuana, or cocaine once per week or more.

CALIFORNIA TREND

	1985-86	1987-88
Beer	20.1%	19.5%
Marijuana	13.4	8.5
Cocaine	3.0	1.2

Note: Data are available only for the two years shown.

▲ **National Average:** Available national data are not comparable to California's data. National statistics show that overall drug use, including cocaine and crack, among high school seniors declined between 1987 and 1988, though 57% had tried an illicit drug at some time, and over 1/3 had tried an illicit drug other than marijuana. (This survey does not include the 15-50% of youngsters not finishing high school.) In 1988, 64% of high school seniors report using alcohol.
● **State Rank:** Not Available
■ **Notable Facts:** Anglo and Asian groups showed the greatest decline in use of substances at all grade levels surveyed, and account for much of the decline in overall substance use. Anglo and Native American students were the most frequent users and Asians were the least frequent users.

Sources: Institute for Social Research, "Monitoring the Future", (University of Michigan 1989); Rodney Skager, Sandra Frith, and Ebrahim Maddahian, *Second Statewide Survey of Drug and Alcohol Use Among California Students In Grades 7, 9, 11: Executive Summary and Selected Excerpts* (Sacramento, CA: Prepared for Attorney General John Van De Kamp, Department of Justice, June 1988).

21 INCARCERATED JUVENILES

Refers to: The number of juveniles placed in custody of public institutions (including California Youth Authority, county juvenile halls and camps) per 100,000 juveniles.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1983	1985	1987
390	430	498

Note: The National Office on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention administers a census every two years. Because 1987 data were not available for private institutions, this analysis relies on incarceration rates for public institutions only.

▲ **National Average:** 208 in 1987
● **State Rank:** 50th in 1987
■ **Notable Facts:** The rate of incarcerating juveniles in California increases significantly when private as well as public institutions are taken into account (543 per 100,000 in 1985). Currently, the California Youth Authority is operating at 150% of the institution's capacity. It costs taxpayers $24,500 each year to keep a young person in the California Youth Authority; many of these youngsters could be treated by community-based programs, such as the Supervised Independent Program at a cost of about $7,000 each year. In 1989/90, the state, counties, and federal government will spend over $600 million for California youthful offenders placed out of their homes in public institutions.

Sources: California State Legislative Analyst Office, *The 1989-90 Budget: Perspectives and Issues*, (Sacramento, CA: LAO 1989); Dan Macallair, National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, (San Francisco, CA, May 1989); U.S. Department of Justice, "Juvenile Justice Bulletin" (Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, October 1988).

INVESTING IN FAMILIES

AVAILABILITY OF CHILD CARE (INCLUDING LATCHKEY)

Refers to: The percentage of children whose parents need child care who are able to obtain it.

CALIFORNIA TREND

There is no annual count of the number of children in California whose parents need child care (i.e., The number of children under age 14 who live in a single-parent or two-parent family and whose parents work or are in education or training programs). The only information about children obtaining child care is the count of children served by the state's child development programs. It shows that 110,000 children were served by the Child Development Division in 1986. In addition, 950,000 tax-filers claimed a tax credit for child care on their tax returns in 1988/9. Approximately 234,000 children ages 6-14 are eligible for subsidized "latchkey" care, while 7% of these children (16,500) are actually served.

▲ **National Average:** Because the state-based data on child care are so incomplete, it is not possible to get a national count of the percentage of children needing child care who receive it. What is known is there are about 30 million children under age 15 with mothers in the labor force, the majority of whom work full time. An estimated 2 to 7 million latchkey children nationally come home to empty homes or have no supervision.

● **State Rank:** Not available

■ **Notable Facts:** California spends substantially more state money for child care than any other state (approximately $338 million in General Fund dollars in 1988/89). Yet California's Senate Office of Research still estimates that in 1988 only 20 - 25% of parents who need subsidized child care in California currently receive it. The state Department of Education estimates that 134,000 children are on waiting lists for child care programs in California. The California Child Care Resource and Referral Network reports that the greatest unmet need for child care is for young children (under age 2) -- 50% of requests made to resource and referral agencies are for infant care. The already overburdened child care system in California will need to accomodate a sizeable number of additional children over the next few years as the state and federal workfare programs (GAIN and the Family Support Act) go into effect; these programs require many mothers on welfare to find child care for their children so they can enter jobs, job training or education programs.

Sources: California Legislative Analyst Office, *The Child Development Program: A Sunset Report* (Sacramento, CA: Feb. 1989); California Legislative Analyst Office, *The 1989/90 Budget: Perspectives and Issues* (Sacramento, CA: 1989); California State Department of Education, *Triennial Report On Publicly Funded Child Development Programs 1985-86*, (Sacramento, SDE, Program Evaluation and Research Division 1988); California Senate Office of Research, "Facts About Child Care" (Sacramento, CA: Senate Office of Research 1988); Children's Defense Fund, *Child Care: The Time is Now* (Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund 1987); U.S. Department of Commerce, *Current Population Reports: Household Economic Studies, Series P70, #9*, (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census, May 1987); U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, *Families and Child Care: Improving the Options*, *"Who's Minding the Kids? "* ,(Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office 1984).

HOMELESS CHILDREN

Refers to: The number of children and youth under age 18 who live in shelters and on the street because they have no home.

CALIFORNIA TREND

Reliable information about homeless children in California is not available. Estimates range from 30,000 to 80,000. The California Department of Education estimates there are 25,000 school-aged children who are homeless,

11,000 of whom attend school and 14,000 of whom do not attend on a regular basis. There may be as many as 25,000 runaway youth in California on any given day -- 25% of the nation's runaway population.

▲ **National Average:** An estimated 500,000-800,000 children are homeless in the United States.

● **State Rank:** Not available

■ **Notable Facts:** Homeless and runaway youth are especially at risk for mental and physical problems including chronic depression, sexually transmitted diseases, and substance abuse. California has the largest low income housing shortage of any state in the nation -- four times as many low income families need low income rental units as there are units available.

Sources: California Senate Office of Research, "Shelter and Services: Solutions to the Burgeoning Crisis of Homelessness" Issue Brief, (Sacramento, CA: March 1985); California State Department of Education estimates based on survey of school districts in California and a survey of homeless shelters by the California Homeless Coalition; Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, *Holes in the Safety Net: Poverty Programs and Policies in the States*, based on information compiled by the Low Income Housing Information Service using Census data, (Washington D.C: CBPP 1989); U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, hearing on "The Crisis in Homelessness: The Effect on Children and Families", February 24, 1987, (estimates from National Coalition for the Homeless).

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN
(PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS)

Refers to: The maximum monthly grant payment for a low income family of 3, with at least one dependent child, and the average number of children receiving such payments each month. The years presented are fiscal years.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89
$587	$617	$633	$663
1,089,780	1,133,992	1,147,967	NA

▲ **National Average:** Not Available. (Because each state sets its own level of grant payment and states have widely varying numbers of public assistance (AFDC) recipients, there is no national figure that is comparable to California.)

● **State Rank:** 1 in 1988 (Based on public assistance payments as a percentage of the federal poverty level. The ranking does not take into account the higher cost of living in California relative to other states.)

■ **Notable Facts:** In California, 67% of AFDC (Aid to Families With Dependent Children) recipients were children in 1987-88. California is one of four states in which state law requires that AFDC benefits keep pace with inflation. However, this law was partially suspended on three occasions in the 1980's, and as a result, benefits for poor children have failed to keep pace with inflation in this decade. From 1981 to 1988, rents increased in Los Angeles and San Francisco at more than twice the rate of AFDC grant increases. In many communities in California, "fair market rents" are higher each month than the entire AFDC grant. Increasingly, the homeless in California include mothers and children receiving AFDC.

Sources: California State Department of Social Services, May 1989; Children's Defense Fund, *A Vision for America's Future*, (Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund 1989); Policy Analysis for California Education, *Conditions of Children in California*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley 1989); U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, *Benefits Under the Aid to Families With Dependent Children Program*, March 7, 1989; Western Center on Law and Poverty, *"Factsheet About the Governor's Proposed Denial of Cost-Of-Living Increases to Needy Children"*, (Sacramento, 1989).

HUNGRY CHILDREN

CALIFORNIA TREND

There is no reliable information on the extent of hunger among children in California.

Experts believe the number of children living in poverty (1.6 million in 1988) is the best proxy measure for hungry children. The only estimates of hungry children in California -- made by the Sacramento Bee and derived necessarily by relatively crude methods -- show: 1.1 million California youngsters must turn to privately operated charitable food pantries for their sustenance; 500,000 parents go to bed hungry so their children can eat, and 167,000 children go to bed hungry at least once a month.

▲ **National Average:** The Physicians' Task Force on Hunger in America estimates that 500,000 children nationwide are affected by malnutrition nationally, and that far more are hungry.

● **State Rank:** Not Available

■ **Notable Facts:** In California, of the roughly 1 million children who qualify for free or reduced price school meals, only about 290,000 actually received school breakfast in 1987/88 and only about 190,000 received meals during the summer.

Sources: California Department of Education Statistics, 1987-88; California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation, "Facts About Hunger and Poverty in California", through the California Poverty Data Base on HandsNet; Children's Defense Fund, *A Vision for America's Future* (Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund 1989); Sacramento Bee "Poverty Preys Hardest on Children," March 1, 1987; United States Department of Agriculture, unpublished statistics, 1987-88.

CHILD SUPPORT

Refers to: The percentage of child support orders receiving some payment.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1986	1987	1988
62.4%	43.5%	39.8%

Note: Data was not collected prior to 1986.

▲ **National Average:** In 1986, 54.4% of eligible mothers received some amount of child support. In this same year, $5 billion was collected in child support -- representing 49% of the amount owed.

● **State Rank:** 14th of 42 states in 1986 (Based on the percentage of child support cases for which at least one payment was made.)

■ **Notable Facts:** In 1988, 45% of total payments owed for court-ordered child support in California were collected (totaling $307 million). The average amount of child support collected in California in 1988 was $191 per month per child.

Sources: California State Department of Social Services, Statistical Services Section, Form CS825A; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *Child Support Enforcement: 12th Annual Report to Congress*, (Washington, D.C.: Office of Child Support Enforcement 1987)

CHILDREN IN POVERTY

Refers to: The number (in millions) and percentage of children under 18 years old living below the poverty level (currently $11,650 annual income for a family of four). Because of the dramatic rise in child poverty in California in the early 1980's, we present a trend covering eight years to accurately reflect the childhood poverty picture.

CALIFORNIA TREND

1980	1982	1984	1986	1988
0.9	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.6
15.2%	20.7%	23.4%	21.9%	20.8%

Note: U.S. figures for 1987 are comparable to California's 1988 figures.

▲ **National Average:** 20.6% in 1987 (13 million).

● **State Rank:** 35th in 1987 (Based on the average child poverty rate for the period 1983-1987.)

■ **Notable Facts:** In 1987, 34.2% of Latino children lived below the poverty level in California, compared to 28.9% of Black children and 14.2% of Anglo children. A variety of studies have shown that poor children are three times more likely to die in infancy, four times more likely to become pregnant as teenagers, and are more likely to suffer serious illness, abuse, neglect, and to drop out of school than are their non-poor counterparts. In 1970, 12.5% of California's children lived in poverty; the percentage of children living in poverty increased 66% between 1970 and 1988.

Sources: California State Department of Finance, Current Population Surveys, 1981-1988; Children's Defense Fund, *A Vision for America's Future*, (Washington, D.C.: CDF 1989); Policy Analysis for California Education, *Conditions of Children in California* (Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, School of Education 1989); Robert Valdez, "Latino Children and Families in the Southwest", Conference proceedings from The Health and Nutrition of Mexican American Children, Stanford University, April 1989.

VIII.

Data Appendix

The Limitations Of Existing Information About California's Children

We recognize how difficult it is to develop appropriate measuring sticks and to interpret the numbers that do exist. We do not presume that our method is the only valid approach, but we do hope that this first report encourages state agencies and legislative committees to improve the state's information system for children so Californians can become better informed about, and take action to address, pressing concerns. We also hope our report serves to identify gaps in needed information so they can be filled.

In doing this project, the limitations of existing information about children posed a major constraint. Much of the data needed to assess what is happening with children and families is either not available, out of date, or inaccurate. For example, the most current reliable information about infant mortality is for 1986. It is imperfect at best for policymakers to make budget and planning decisions for 1990 based on information from 1986. In addition, for important issues like homelessness, child care including preschool education, and mental health, no reliable statewide information is available on an annual basis.

Comments On The Methodology Used In This Report

Trend Analysis: In analyzing the trend for each Benchmark, the most recent four years of data are presented. A trend was considered to be improving if performance improved for the most recent two years. If the pattern was not consistent for two consecutive years, we included the performance for a third year in our analysis. If there was still no consecutive two-year pattern, we presented an additional year of data. In any case in which the additional year did not demonstrate a clear trend, we compared the performance in the earliest year presented with the most recent year. Data on the number of children living in poverty are presented for a longer period of time in order to educate the public about the significant increase in childhood poverty that began in California in the early 1980's.

Comparison to the National Average: The analysis of "better" or "worse" than the national average was based on whether California performed better or worse during the most recent year for which data are available. In some instances, the most recent comparable year is as long ago as 1986. If there are differences in what the state and national data represent, the differences are noted.

Rankings: Rankings are out of a possible 51 (50 states and the District of Columbia); a rank of #1 indicates best, 51 is worst. Rankings, too, are based on the most recent year for which comparable data are available.

Grades: Grades are based on trend analysis, comparison to the national average, and rankings for each indicator. In other words, the overall grade for Health is based on how each of the six health indicators performs on these three factors. Each indicator receives 4 points if the trend is improving (0 if it is not); 4 points if it is better than the national average (0 if it is not); and 4 points if California ranks among the ten best states (0 if it does not). "Incompletes" count for 1 point. For each indicator under Health, the points are totalled and divided by the number of points that could be received. "Not Availables" are dropped out. Based on this method, the score for Health is 45%; for Education, 45%; for Safety, 3%; for Teen Years, 17%; and for Investing in Families, 34%. Actual grades are based on percentages as follows:

A= 75-100%
B= 55-74%
C= 35-54%
D= 15-34%
U= less than 15%

IX.

Acknowledgements

We are extremely grateful to a number of people who helped us collect and interpret the information in this report and develop the Action Plan. First and foremost, Children Now's Policy Advisors and Distinguished Citizen Panel provided invaluable guidance about the overall direction of the project, about specific indicators, and about policy directions. The project benefited greatly from their rich expertise and vision. We also thank Michael Kirst and the authors of the PACE report, "Conditions of Children in California" -- the springboard for this report.

We very much appreciate the help from Children Now staff -- Lauren Asher, Nancy Takahashi, Mary Reynolds, Demetria Boykins-Chestnutt, Julie Serquinia, Robyn Kawakami, and Ricardo Bracho. They assisted us with fact-finding and the final production and dissemination of this report.

We are also grateful to staff in the California state agencies who helped us find and interpret available numbers: Michiko Tashiro, Pat Schwartz, and Jack Metz from Health; Bill Burson, Richard Diaz, Tom Fong, Jim Spano and Dr. Dorothy Knoell in Education; Robin Wolfson, Kathy Allen and Stan Morigucci in the Child Development Division and Carolyn Mangrum in Headstart; Marcus Clark, Lee Copenhagen, Marcy Brown, Dave Simpson, and Charlotte Rhea in Juvenile Justice; Ray Bacon, Sharon Miller, Marion Porter, Susan Derrick and Cheryl Mello in Social Services; and Donna Olsson, Nancy Austin, Terry Macrae and Pat Fugami in the Legislative Analyst Office and Finance.

We were assisted all along the way by a wide variety of individuals and organizations. Our sincere thanks to Elisabeth Kersten and Jack Hailey of the Senate Office of Research for their help in obtaining and interpreting available data. We are grateful to Sandra Goodwin with the Assembly Committee on Health for providing us with data on the mental health of children. Elaine Zimmerman and Christy Laird with the State Joint Select Task Force on the Changing Family also provided helpful insights and information.

We would like to thank a variety of other individuals in California who added insights or information to this report. They include Sue Brock, Sid Gardner, Laurie True, Eileen Peck, Eva Vasquez, Steve Fox, Jose Colon, Linda Purcell, Kati Haycock, Kathleen West, Ruth Holton, Claire Brindis, Richard Rothstein, Don Hamilton, Marcus Clark, Cliva Mee, Doug McKeever, Paul Crissey, Casey McKeever, Dr. Richard Brown, Dr. Richard Van Horn, Beverly Abbott, Betsy Burke, Eligio Vella, Blaire Brooke, and Jean McIntosh.

We received advice and data regarding the national picture from a number of organizations and federal agencies. We are extremely grateful to staff of the U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, including our Policy Advisor Ann Rosewater and staffmembers Karabelle Pizzagati and Jill Kagan. Our thanks go as well to a number of people at the Children's Defense Fund who provided us with various kinds of help, including our Policy Advisor Marian Edelman and staff Sara Rosenbaum, Janet Simons, Kay Johnson, Nancy Ebb, Amy Wilkins, Joseph Liu, Gina Adams, Ray O'Brien, Mark Real, and MaryLee Allen. Special thanks to Judith Weitz who spent a day in California consulting with us on this project.

We are also very grateful to our Policy Advisor Bob Greenstein, Director of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and to Kathy Porter and Stefan Harvey on his staff. Staff of the American Humane Association and Nadine Abrahams with the National Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse helped us with the abuse and neglect figures. We thank Pat Ramsay and Bill Scarbrough, staff of the National Resource Center for Children in Poverty, for their suggestions and help as well as Dr. Toshi Tatara at the American Public Welfare Association and Laurie Garducci at the National Academy of Sciences. Our thanks to Fred Beamer and George Brown with the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, and to Sue Kline and Doug Thomas with the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. We also thank Diane Herz with the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

CHILDREN NOW'S POLICY ADVISORS

C. Richard Allen, CEO, Pacific Triangle Management Corporation

Nancy Amidei, Syndicated Columnist Specializing in Human Services

Margaret Brodkin, Director, Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth

Brian Cahill, President, Hathaway Children's Services

Nancy Daly, Chair, Los Angeles County Commission for Children's Services

Peter Du Bois, CEO, Medical Group of Children's Hospital Los Angeles

Marian Wright Edelman, President, Children's Defense Fund

Robert Greenstein, Director, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

Neal Halfon, Director, Center for the Vulnerable Child

Honorable Shirley M. Hufstedler, Hufstedler, Miller, Kaus, & Beardsley

Judith Jones, Director, National Resource Center for Children in Poverty

Celeste Kaplan, Chair, Los Angeles Roundtable for Children

Sam Karp, CEO, HandsNet

Michael Kirst, Director, Policy Analysis for California Education

Jacqueline McCroskey, Asst. Prof., University of Southern California School of Social Work

Luis Nogales, Business Consultant; Former Chairman and CEO, UPI

Ann Rosewater, Staff Director, U.S. Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families

Lois Salisbury, Managing Attorney, Public Advocates; Chair of Health Access

Carla Sanger, Co-Chair, School Readiness Task Force

Lisbeth Schorr, Author of *Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage*

Karen Hill-Scott, Director, Crystal Stairs

Patty Siegel, Director, California Child Care Resource and Referral Network

Theodore Shaw, NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc.

Sherry L. Skelly, Legislative Advocate, California Children's Lobby

Mark Soler, Executive Director, Youth Law Center

Robert Valdez, Health Policy Analyst, The RAND Corporation

Vivian Weinstein, Board Member, California Children's Council

Linda Wong, Executive Director, California Tomorrow

NOTE: Organizational affiliations are listed for identification purposes only.

Special thanks to Geri Hathaway Design and Westside Print Works

What Others Say About the Children Now Report Card & Briefing Book

"Bravo. This Report Card is a tool for holding all Californians accountable for how our children are faring. Let's set about the task of making California a 'Grade A' state for children."

U.S. Congressman George Miller (7th District of California), Chairman, Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, U.S. House of Representatives

"As a high school teacher, I know that students need high expectations in order to succeed. Certainly, we should also have high expectations for our state performance, and this Report Card helps set the standards we should strive to meet."

Jaime Escalante, Teacher, Garfield High School and subject of the film "Stand and Deliver"

"This Report Card shows that we're losing too many children to drugs, homelessness, and crime. It is imperative that Californians wake up and act now."

Richard Riordan, Senior Partner, Riordan & McKinzie

"There's no doubt that a college education begins with preparing young children. I'm delighted this report card points the way toward more emphasis on preventive strategies for children."

Dr. Donald Kennedy, President, Stanford University

"As shocking as these statistics are for California's children overall, this Report Card also directs our attention to many poor children, often disproportionately children of color. These children will form the backbone of our 21st century workforce, and we cannot continue to neglect them."

Honorable Allen Broussard, Justice, California Supreme Court

"This Report Card looks beneath the surface to help us understand what's happening with our children. Together, we can use the extremely valuable information in this report to make our state, once again, a leader on behalf of children and families."

Honorable Shirley Hufstedler, former U.S. Secretary of Education

"Schools can't do the job by themselves. We need to be part of a comprehensive strategy to improve the quality of life for all children."

Bill Honig, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

"All of us who care about the future of California should take note of the news in this Report Card. We must do more. We can begin by setting achievable goals for making California a better home to children and families."

State Senator Robert Presley (Riverside), Chair, Senate Select Committee on Children and Youth

"This Report Card reminds us that children don't come in small pieces and that we must look at all of their needs and how they interrelate. Let's join forces in supporting an agenda that improves the overall picture for California's youngsters."

State Senator Becky Morgan (Los Altos Hills), Chair, Select Committee on Infant and Child Care and Development

"The challenge for California is to address the needs of our multi-cultural population in a sensitive and effective way through a partnership between government, business, and parents. This Report Card is a blueprint for beginning to meet that challenge."

Ron Wakabayashi, Vice President for Planning and Problem Solving, United Way of Los Angeles

"Children Now has charted important new territory with this California Report Card. I hope parents, citizens, business leaders, and government officials at the national, state, and local levels will run with the idea of setting goals and measuring whether we are meeting them for America's children."

Marian Wright Edelman, President, Children's Defense Fund

CALIFORNIA: THE STATE OF OUR CHILDREN

REPORT CARD '89

EDUCATION	C
HEALTH	C
SAFETY	U
TEEN YEARS	D-
INVESTING IN FAMILIES	D+
OVERALL GRADE	D

HOW CALIFORNIA TREATS ITS CHILDREN

A Publication Of Children Now™

Who Prepared This Report Card?

This report card was prepared by **Children Now** in conjunction with a panel of distinguished California citizens:

Honorable Allen Broussard, Justice, California State Supreme Court
Jaime Escalante, Teacher, Garfield High School and subject of the film "Stand & Deliver"
Honorable Shirley Hufstedler, former U.S. Secretary of Education
Dr. Donald Kennedy, President, Stanford University
Peter V. Ueberroth
and **Children Now's Policy Advisors**, 28 leading children's policy and research analysts from California and throughout the nation.
(See back page for complete listing.)

How to Use This Report Card.

Children Now and others prepared this Report Card in order to help Californians help their children. The Report Card is designed to:

- Identify the needs of children and establish clear guidelines for how to measure progress in meeting these needs.

- Provide information which enables California's decision makers to take action and improve the lives of California's 7.6 million children. (The Report Card also identifies where needed information does not exist.)

- Encourage Californians to set measurable goals and tangible outcomes for helping children and to monitor progress over time.

For copies of the Report Card and for detailed briefing material about the 27 children's indicators upon which the California Report Card is based, please write: Children Now, 10951 West Pico Blvd., Los Angeles, California, 90064.

Report Card 1989

Name: *California*
For: *How California Treats Its Children*
Overall Grade: *D*
Summary: *Invest in the Right Start for Children, Now.*

Comments to Californians:

Are these grades good enough for your children?

Far too many of our children now face failure. This Report Card gives Californians a clear and comprehensive picture of the well-being of children in this state and it shows we need to act, NOW.

What do these grades mean?

They are a strong warning signal and a call to action. California needs a vigorous new partnership of government, business and parents to turn these discouraging grades into high marks.

Is there any good news?

Yes. Much is already being done by California's many dedicated parents and conscientious professionals who work with children or on their behalf.

How can we improve?

INVEST IN THE RIGHT START FOR CHILDREN:

Californians can work together to ensure that every child receives:

- **A Good Beginning:** through early health care, early childhood education, and help for parents and families.
- **The Basics:** including nutritious food, secure shelter, safety from abuse and neglect, and an enriching home environment.
- **Opportunities for Economic Independence:** through quality education, job training, and economic opportunities -- as well as programs for drug abusers, pregnant teens, juvenile offenders, and at-risk youth.

Troubling Facts:

Facts About California's Performance for Children*

California Has Gotten Worse:
In 11 of 21 benchmarks (52%), California's performance has gotten worse over the last few years.

California Is Doing Worse Than the Nation:
In 14 of 18 benchmarks (78%), California is worse than the national average.

California Is Not in the 10 Best States:
In 11 of 14 benchmarks (79%), California fails to be among the 10 best states.

Incompletes:
For 6 of 27 important benchmarks (22%), the information available is incomplete and performance cannot be assessed.

*These are based on the most recent information available. In some areas, data are unavailable and not all 27 "benchmarks" can be calculated.

How Were The Grades Assigned?

Explanation Of Grades:

A = *Excellent* **B** = *Good* **C** = *Needs Improvement*
D = *Seriously Deficient* **U** = *Unsatisfactory*

California's grades are based on statistical data for 27 different health, education, and other measurable indicators of children's well-being. (See next page.) Each indicator was then analyzed to see if the situation for children in California is:

- getting better or getting worse
- better or worse than the national average
- ranked in the top10 best states on each benchmark.

Benchmarks:

For Measuring the Well-Being of California's Children

Indicator	Trend In California	Compared To National Avg.	Rank: Among Ten Best States?
Children's Health			
Infant Mortality	Better*	Better	Yes (8th)
Late or No Prenatal Care	Worse	Better	No (36th)
Inadequate Immunization	Better	Worse	NA
Uninsured Children	Worse	Worse	NA
Use of Nutrition Program	Better	Worse	No (45th)
Children's Mental Health	Incomplete	NA	NA
Children's Education			
Graduation Rates	Worse*	Worse	No (42nd)
Preschool Education	Incomplete	NA	NA
Achievement Scores	Better	NA	NA
SAT Scores	Better	Better	Yes (4th of 22)
Student/Teacher Ratio	Better	Worse	No (50th)
Per Pupil Expenditures	Better	Worse	No (30th)
Children's Safety			
Child Abuse/Neglect	Worse	Worse	No (48th)
Children In Foster Care	Worse	Worse	NA
Drug Exposed Babies	Incomplete	NA	NA
Youth Homicides	Worse*	Worse	NA
Teen Years And Beyond			
College Bound Students	Worse*	Worse	NA
Unemployed Youth	Better	Worse	No (33rd)
Teen Births	Worse	Worse	No (23rd)
Drugs/Alcohol	Better	NA	NA
Incarcerated Juveniles	Worse	Worse	No (50th)
Investing In Families			
Child Care	Incomplete	NA	NA
Homeless Children	Incomplete	NA	NA
Public Assistance Payments	Better	NA	Yes (1st)
Hungry Children	Incomplete	NA	NA
Child Support	Worse	Better	No (14 of 42)
Children in Poverty	Worse	Worse	No (35th)

Notes:

Trends are based on the most recent four years of information. When no clear trend emerges, data from additional years are analyzed. An * indicates the trend is based on 5 years. Ranks are out of a possible 51 (including 50 states and the District of Columbia), with 1 being best and 51 being worst.

NA = Information not available.

Incomplete= Available data is incomplete so no trend can be determined.

Looking Behind The Grades:

Children Who Slip Through The Cracks

This report card is based on information about **all** the children in California. However, these statistics sometimes mask far more serious problems for particular groups of children. There are many examples; the following are just a few.

1. Poverty:

National studies show that poverty is perhaps the most significant factor which will determine the health, education and future of a child. While information about poor children in these **"Benchmarks"** is practically non-existent, in California we do know that:

- 21% of all California's children live in poverty, compared to 34% of Latino and 29% of Black children in California.

2. Graduation Rates:

- Although 32% of California's 10th graders do not graduate from high school in three years, the figure is 48% for Black students and 45% for Latino students.

3. Children's Health:

- Black infants are nearly twice as likely to die before their first birthday as other babies.

4. Foster Care:

- The number of children under age five in foster care increased 120% between 1983 and 1988. Children under age 5 now represent more than a third (34%) of all children in foster care.

Children Now's Policy Advisors

C. Richard Allen, CEO, Pacific Triangle Management Corporation
Nancy Amidei, Syndicated Columnist Specializing in Human Services
Margaret Brodkin, Director, Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth
Brian Cahill, President, Hathaway Children's Services
Nancy Daly, Chair, Los Angeles County Commission for Children's Services
Peter Du Bois, CEO, Medical Group of Children's Hospital Los Angeles
Marian Wright Edelman, President, Children's Defense Fund
Robert Greenstein, Director, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
Neal Halfon, Director, Center for the Vulnerable Child
Honorable Shirley M. Hufstedler, Hufstedler, Miller, Kaus, & Beardsley
Judith Jones, Director, National Resource Center for Children in Poverty
Celeste Kaplan, Chair, Los Angeles Roundtable for Children
Sam Karp, Chief Executive Officer, HandsNet
Michael Kirst, Director, Policy Analysis for California Education
Jacqueline McCroskey, Assistant Professor, USC School of Social Work
Luis Nogales, Business Consultant; Former Chairman and CEO, UPI
Ann Rosewater, Staff Director, U.S. Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families
Lois Salisbury, Managing Attorney, Public Advocates; Chair of Health Access
Carla Sanger, Co-Chair, School Readiness Task Force
Lisbeth Schorr, Author of Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage
Karen Hill-Scott, Director, Crystal Stairs
Patty Siegel, Director, California Child Care Resource and Referral Network
Theodore Shaw, NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc.
Sherry L. Skelly, Legislative Advocate, California Children's Lobby
Mark Soler, Executive Director, Youth Law Center
Robert Valdez, Health Policy Analyst, The RAND Corporation
Vivian Weinstein, Board Member, California Children's Council
Linda Wong, Executive Director, California Tomorrow

Note: Organizational affiliations are listed for identification purposes only.

Children Now

Children Now is a non-partisan, statewide organization whose mission is to improve the lives of California's 7.6 million children. Children Now acts as a strong and consistent voice for all of California's children, with a particular emphasis on children and families who are poor or at risk. Our goal is to educate the public and decision makers about the needs of children and to generate increased resources for effective programs that serve them.

Children Now blends substantive policy expertise with effective communications and advocacy strategies. We emphasize an integrated and preventive approach to investing in children — an approach designed to build a partnership among policy makers, the private sector, service providers, parents, and concerned volunteers.

Children Now operates statewide, with offices in Los Angeles, Oakland, and Sacramento. We are financed through foundation grants, individual donations, and support from the corporate and entertainment communities.

Board of Directors

Angela Blackwell	Urban Strategies Council
Hon. Allen E. Broussard	California Supreme Court
William Coblentz	Coblentz, Cahen, McCabe & Breyer
Charles Collins	Western Development Group
Geoffrey Cowan	Chilmark Productions, Inc.
Anita L. DeFrantz	Amateur Athletic Foundation
Kati Haycock	The Achievement Council
Danny Goldberg	Gold Mountain Records
F. Warren Hellman	Hellman & Friedman
Donald Kennedy	Stanford University
Judy Miller	Braun & Company
Frank Quevedo	MALDEF
Jim Plunkett	Los Angeles Raiders - Retired
Judith Prowda	Management Consultant
Hon. Cruz Reynoso	Kaye, Scholer et al.
Richard J. Riordan	Riordan & McKinzie
George Roberts	Kohlberg Kravis Roberts & Co.
Marlene Saritzky	UBU Productions
Leigh Steinberg	Sports Attorney
Thomas Steyer	HFS Partners
Michael Tollin	Halcyon Days Productions
James Steyer	Children Now, President

Children Now Offices:

Los Angeles
10951 W. Pico Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90064
(213) 470-2444

Oakland
660 13th Street, Suite 300
Oakland, CA 94612
(415) 763-2444

A Product of Children Now

Project Director: Wendy Lazarus, Vice President for Policy
Creative Director: Laurie Lipper, Director of Communications
Policy Assistant: Michelle Gonzalez, Policy Associate

Special Thanks to: James P. Steyer, President and Cynthia D. Robbins, Executive Director

Design donated by Scott Mednick and Associates/LA, Debbie Ross, The Creative Trust. Special thanks to the McKesson Foundation and AT&T.

©1989, Children Now™. Permission to copy, disseminate or otherwise use this work is normally granted by copyright owner as long as ownership is properly attributed to Children Now.